



MARK WARDLAW
Director

DARREN GRETLER
Assistant Director

County of San Diego
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 110, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92123
INFORMATION (858) 694-2960
TOLL FREE (800) 411-0017
www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds

June 14, 2013

CEQA Initial Study - Environmental Checklist Form
(Based on the State CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G)

1. Title; Project Number(s); Environmental Log Number:

VALIANO; PDS2013-SP-13-001, PDS2013-GPA-13-001, PDS2013-STP-13-003,
PDS2013-TM-5575, PDS2013-REZ-13-001, PDS2013-ER-12-08-002

2. Lead agency name and address:

County of San Diego, Planning & Development Services
5510 Overland Avenue, Suite 110
San Diego, CA 92123-1239

3. Contact: Beth Ehsan, Project Manager

Phone number: 858-694-3103

E-mail: beth.ehsan@sdcounty.ca.gov.

4. Project location:

The project includes 12 parcels and 209.3 acres located mostly north of Mount Whitney Road and west of Country Club/Harmony Grove Drive in the Eden Valley portion of the San Dieguito Community Planning Area of unincorporated San Diego County.

Thomas Guide Coordinates: Page 1129, Grids B2, 3, & 4; C3 & 4

5. Project Applicant name and address:

Eden Hills Project Owner, LLC
Lance Waite, Integral Communities
2235 Encinitas Blvd, #216
Encinitas, CA 92024
lwait@integralcommunities.com

6. General Plan
Community Plan: San Dieguito
Land Use Designation: Semi-Rural 2 (SR-2)
Density: 0.5 du/ acre
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) n/a
7. Zoning
Use Regulation: A-70
Minimum Lot Size: 1 and 2 acres
Special Area Regulation: -- /C
8. Description of project:

The project is a general plan amendment, specific plan, rezone, site plan and major subdivision to develop 362 residential lots on 209.3 acres. The site is located in the Eden Valley area of the San Dieguito Community Planning Area, between the cities of San Marcos and Escondido within unincorporated San Diego County. The project site is located on Mt. Whitney Road at Country Club Drive.

The site is subject to the General Plan Semi-Rural Regional Category, Semi-Rural 1 (SR-1) and Semi-Rural 2 (SR-2) Land Use Designation. The project would require a General Plan Amendment to change the designation to Semi-Rural 0.5 (SR-0.5). Zoning for the site is Agricultural (A70). The site contains one home and other structures to be removed and a historic barn to remain. The property is currently zoned A70 with minimum lots sizes of 1 and 2 acres. A Rezone would be required to reduce the minimum lot size and change the A70 areas to RS. A Specific Plan and Site Plan would establish setbacks, etc, which will vary across the five proposed neighborhoods.

The project proposes a private gated residential development of 362 residential lots and 17 open space lots and easements of 109 acres, with preservation of both agriculture and native habitats. Proposed minimum lot size ranges from 4,500 square feet in neighborhood 1 to 7,000 square feet in neighborhoods 2 and 3. Typical surrounding lot sizes are 2 to 4 acres to the west and 1 acre to the east. To the northeast are mobile home parks and to the north across La Moree are 5,000 square foot lots. To the south is the Harmony Grove Village Specific Plan, Planning Area 3, which is planned for a density of just over 1 dwelling unit per acre and lot sizes of approximately one half acre. The Village boundary is located about one-quarter mile south of neighborhoods 1 and 2, and adjoins the southwestern edge of neighborhood 5. The project would take access from Hill Valley Drive, Mount Whitney Road, and Country Club Drive. Offsite improvements on Country Club Drive may be required. Proposed grading is 700,000 cubic yards of balanced cut and fill (average 3,500 cubic yards per acre). The project would also include public multi-use trails, smaller private trails, an equestrian staging area and park land. Water service would be provided by the Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water District. The preferred option for sewer service is a wastewater treatment plant operated by the San Diego County

Sanitation District. If the Vallecitos Municipal Water District sewer option is selected, an offsite sewer line extension would be required. The proposed fire service provider is the San Marcos Fire Protection District.

9. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

<u>Permit Type/Action</u>	<u>Agency</u>
General Plan Amendment	County of San Diego
Major Use Permit (WWTP)	County of San Diego
Site Plan	County of San Diego
Rezone	County of San Diego
Specific Plan	County of San Diego
Vesting Tentative Map	County of San Diego
Road Opening	County of San Diego
County Right-of-Way Permits	County of San Diego
Construction Permit	
Excavation Permit	
Encroachment Permit	
Grading Permit	County of San Diego
Habitat Loss Permit	County of San Diego
401 Permit - Water Quality Certification	Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB)
404 Permit – Dredge and Fill	US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)
1603 – Streambed Alteration Agreement	CA Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW)
Section 7 - Consultation or Section 10a Permit – Incidental Take	US Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS)
Air Quality Permit to Construct	Air Pollution Control District (APCD)
Air Quality Permit to Operate – Title V Permit	APCD
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit	RWQCB
General Industrial Stormwater Permit	RWQCB
General Construction Stormwater Permit	RWQCB
Fire District Approval	San Marcos Fire Protection District
Water District Approval	Rincon Del Diablo Municipal Water District
School District Approval	Escondido Union School District Escondido Union High School District
McClellan- Palomar Airport Land Use Compatibility Determination	San Diego Regional Airport Authority
Annexation and Formation Approval	Local Agency Formation Commission

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED: The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project and involve at least one

impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" or a "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Aesthetics</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Agriculture and Forest Resources</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Air Quality</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Biological Resources</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Cultural Resources</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Geology & Soils</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Hazards & Haz. Materials</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Hydrology & Water Quality</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Land Use & Planning</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> <u>Mineral Resources</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Noise</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Population & Housing</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Public Services</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Recreation</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Transportation/Traffic</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Utilities & Service Systems</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <u>Mandatory Findings of Significance</u>

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, Planning & Development Services finds that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ On the basis of this Initial Study, Planning & Development Services finds that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ On the basis of this Initial Study, Planning & Development Services finds that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

Beth Ehsan

Signature

6/17/13

Date

Beth Ehsan

Printed Name

Land Use/Environmental Planner

Title

INSTRUCTIONS ON EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
2. All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
4. "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.
5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
7. The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: A vista is a view from a particular location or composite views along a roadway or trail. Scenic vistas often refer to views of natural lands, but may also be compositions of natural and developed areas, or even entirely of developed and unnatural areas, such as a scenic vista of a rural town and surrounding agricultural lands. What is scenic to one person may not be scenic to another, so the assessment of what constitutes a scenic vista must consider the perceptions of a variety of viewer groups. The items that can be seen within a vista are visual resources. Adverse impacts to individual visual resources or the addition of structures or developed areas may or may not adversely affect the vista. Determining the level of impact to a scenic vista requires analyzing the changes to the vista as a whole and also to individual visual resources.

The San Dieguito Community Plan states that the most scenic views in Harmony Grove are of the hills, valleys, riparian habitat, and grazing farm animals; and that these visual qualities must be preserved. In addition, there are two issues related to scenic resources cited:

Issue COS-1.5 Elfin Forest Road / Harmony Grove Road is on the County Scenic Highway System. Harmony Grove Road has many curves with rocks cut on one side and Escondido Creek with mature vegetation and native wildflowers and rugged mountains lining the other side. It is included in the Conservation and Open Space Element as a County Scenic Corridor.

The project site is approximately 1800 feet from Escondido Creek, and a tributary to Escondido Creek is within the southern part of the project. There are several other vantage points in the vicinity, including Seeforever Drive which overlooks the site from the west, and the public trail behind the new Palomar Pomerado Hospital building which is approximately 4,000 feet to the east and northeast. Including the above scenic vistas, the site may be located near or visible from a scenic vista and may not change the composition of an existing scenic vista. A Visual Resources Report for the proposed project must be prepared. Based on the results of the visual resources analysis, the project may be required to incorporate avoidance, mitigation or design features to be compatible with the existing visual environment in terms of visual character and quality.

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: State scenic highways refer to those highways that are officially designated by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) as scenic (Caltrans - California Scenic Highway Program). Generally, the area defined within a State scenic highway is the land adjacent to and visible from the vehicular right-of-way. The dimension of a scenic highway is usually identified using a motorist's line of vision, but a reasonable boundary is selected when the view extends to the distant horizon. The scenic highway corridor extends to the visual limits of the landscape abutting the scenic highway.

Based on a site visit completed by County staff, the proposed project is not located near or visible within the composite viewshed of a State scenic highway and will not damage or remove visual resources within a State scenic highway. Therefore, the proposed project will not have any substantial adverse effect on a scenic resource within a State scenic highway.

- c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: Visual character is the objective composition of the visible landscape within a viewshed. Visual character is based on the organization of the pattern elements line, form, color, and texture. Visual character is commonly discussed in terms of dominance, scale, diversity and continuity. Visual quality is the viewer's perception of the visual environment and varies based on exposure, sensitivity and expectation of the viewers. The proposed grading is 700,000 cubic yards of balanced cut and fill (average of 3,500 cubic yards per acre). The proposed density of the project is 0.5 dwelling units per acre.

The existing visual character and quality of the project site and surrounding area is characterized by the San Dieguito Community Plan as non-industrial with low densities, which preserve the community's historic rural agricultural character. Per the Elfin Forest Harmony Grove Community Plan, "The historic rural habitat is preserved where the Village is surrounded by large-lot rural homes and small, family owned farms and vineyards that preserve the critical relationships necessary for this environmentally sensitive and balanced green community." With the proposed change in density and volume of earthwork, a detailed visual analysis must be included in the EIR to address the potential aesthetic and landform modification impacts for both on-site and off-site improvements.

- d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The proposed project will use outdoor lighting and is located within Zone B as identified by the San Diego County Light Pollution Code, approximately 40 miles from the Mount Palomar Observatory. However, it will not adversely affect nighttime views or astronomical observations, because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code (Section 59.101-59.115), including the lamp type and shielding requirements per fixture and hours of operation limitations for outdoor lighting.

In addition, the proposed project will control outdoor lighting and sources of glare in the following ways:

1. The project will not install outdoor lighting that directly illuminates neighboring properties.
2. The project will not install outdoor lighting that would cast a direct beam angle towards a potential observer, such as a motorists, cyclist or pedestrian.

3. The project will not install outdoor lighting for vertical surfaces such as buildings, landscaping, or signs in a manner that would result in useful light or spill light being cast beyond the boundaries of intended area to be lit.
4. The project will not install any highly reflective surfaces such as glare-producing glass or high-gloss surface color that will be visible along roadways, pedestrian walkways, or in the line of sight of adjacent properties.

The project will not contribute to significant cumulative impacts on day or nighttime views because the project will conform to the Light Pollution Code. The Code was developed by the San Diego County Planning & Development Services and Department of Public Works in cooperation with lighting engineers, astronomers, land use planners from San Diego Gas and Electric, Palomar and Mount Laguna observatories, and local community planning and sponsor groups to effectively address and minimize the impact of new sources light pollution on nighttime views. The standards in the Code are the result of this collaborative effort and establish an acceptable level for new lighting. Compliance with the Code is required prior to issuance of any building permit for any project. Mandatory compliance for all new building permits ensures that this project in combination with all past, present and future projects will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact. Therefore, compliance with the Code ensures that the project will not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area, on a project or cumulative level.

The project's outdoor lighting may be controlled through Site Plan conditions. Therefore, compliance with the Code, in combination with the outdoor lighting and glare controls listed above ensures that the project will not create a significant new source of substantial light or glare.

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Important Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site has land designated as Unique Farmland and Farmland of Local Importance according to the State Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). In addition, based on a site visit and a review of historic aerial photography, there is evidence of agricultural use on the project site. The site will be evaluated to determine the importance of the resource based on the County's Local Agricultural Resources Assessment (LARA) model which takes into account local factors that define the importance of San Diego County agricultural resources. The LARA model considers the availability of water resources, climate, soil quality, surrounding land use, topography, and land use or parcel size consistency between the project site and surrounding land uses. A more detailed discussion of the LARA model can be found in the Guidelines for Determining Significance for Agricultural Resources at <http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/docs/AG-Guidelines.pdf>. In order for a site to be considered an important agricultural resource based on the LARA model, all three required LARA model factors (water, soil, and climate) must receive either a high or moderate score. A low score in any of these three categories would render a LARA model result that the site is not an important agricultural resource. As such, potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of

Unique Farmland and/or Farmland of Local Importance to a non-agricultural use may occur as a result of this project. Therefore, any potential agricultural impacts from the project must be analyzed in an Agricultural Analysis and discussed in the context of the EIR.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site and the surrounding area are zoned for agricultural use (A-70). The project proposes a rezone and lot sizes that do not allow for agriculture. Therefore, the proposed project may create a conflict with existing uses and zoning. Potential agricultural impacts from the project must be analyzed in an Agricultural Analysis and discussed in the context of the EIR.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), or timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The project site including any offsite improvements do not contain any forest lands as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g); therefore, project implementation would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. In addition, the project is not located in the vicinity of offsite forest resources.

d) Result in the loss of forest land, conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The project site including any offsite improvements do not contain any forest lands as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g); therefore, project implementation would not result in the loss or conversion of forest land to a non-forest use. In addition, the project is not located in the vicinity of offsite forest resources.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site and surrounding area contain active agricultural operations and lands designated as Unique Farmland and Farmland of Local

Importance pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency. As such, potentially significant project or cumulative level conversion of agricultural land to a non-agricultural may occur as a result of this project. Therefore, any potential agricultural impacts from the project must be analyzed in an Agricultural Analysis and discussed in the context of the EIR.

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The project involves a General Plan Amendment that would result in approximately 125 additional residences (an increase from 237 to 362 units based on data reported in the Air Quality Study) than currently allowed on the project site. This development was not anticipated in SANDAG growth projections used in development of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) and may conflict with or obstruct implementation of either the RAQS or applicable portions of the SIP on a project level. One result may be project emissions of ozone precursors that were not considered as a part of the RAQS based on growth projections.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: In general, air quality impacts from land use projects are the result of emissions from motor vehicles, and from short-term construction activities associated with such projects. The San Diego County Land Use Environment Group (LUEG) has established guidelines for determining significance which incorporate the San Diego Air Pollution Control District's (SDAPCD) established screening-level criteria for all new source review (NSR) in APCD Rule 20.2. These screening-level criteria can be used as numeric methods to demonstrate that a project's total emissions (e.g. stationary and fugitive emissions, as well as emissions from mobile sources) would not result in a significant impact to air quality. Since SDAPCD does not have screening-level criteria for emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), the screening level for reactive organic compounds (ROC) from the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) for the Coachella Valley (which are more appropriate for the San Diego Air Basin) are used.

The project involves extensive construction activity along with blasting onsite. Construction activities associated with the project will be phased; therefore, certain phases of the project would be operational while construction is ongoing onsite. Construction and operation of the proposed project would lead to emissions that could violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Air emissions from the project would be evaluated through a technical analysis to quantify maximum daily emissions that can be

compared to the appropriate screening level thresholds, and identify mitigation measures, as necessary.

- c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: San Diego County is presently in non-attainment for the 1-hour concentrations under the National and California Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS and CAAQS) for Ozone (O_3). San Diego County is also presently in non-attainment for the annual geometric mean and for the 24-hour concentrations of Particulate Matter less than or equal to 10 microns (PM_{10}) and 2.5 microns ($PM_{2.5}$) under the CAAQS. O_3 is formed when VOC and nitrogen oxides (NO_x) react in the presence of sunlight. VOC sources include any source that burns fuels (e.g., gasoline, natural gas, wood, oil); solvents; petroleum processing and storage; and pesticides. Sources of PM_{10} in both urban and rural areas include: motor vehicles, wood burning stoves and fireplaces, dust from construction, landfills, agriculture, wildfires, brush/waste burning, and industrial sources of windblown dust from open lands.

As described in (b) above, construction and operation of the project and overlap between different phases would lead to substantial emissions of air pollutants. In particular, emissions of VOCs, NO_x , PM_{10} , and $PM_{2.5}$ could exacerbate ambient air quality conditions in San Diego County, especially considering the nonattainment status of the region with respect to these pollutants. Air emissions from the project will be evaluated and mitigation measures, as necessary, will be proposed as described above.

- d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: Air quality regulators typically define sensitive receptors as schools (Preschool-12th Grade), hospitals, resident care facilities, or day-care centers, or other facilities that may house individuals with health conditions that would be adversely impacted by changes in air quality. The County of San Diego also considers residences as sensitive receptors since they house children and the elderly.

Existing sensitive receptors within ¼ mile of the project vicinity include several existing residences to the west, northeast, east, and southeast. There are no schools, hospitals, or other sensitive receptors within this distance of the project site. Since construction activity will be phased, the project would introduce sensitive receptors onsite while construction is ongoing. Two primary emissions of concern for impacts to sensitive receptors are carbon monoxide (CO) and diesel particulate matter (DPM). Impacts to onsite and offsite receptors need to be addressed through a technical analysis.

- e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
|---|---|

- ☒ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project could produce objectionable odors, which would result from volatile organic compounds, ammonia, carbon dioxide, hydrogen sulfide, methane, alcohols, aldehydes, amines, carbonyls, esters, disulfides dust and endotoxins from the construction and operational phases. In addition, the project could produce objectionable odors, which would result from the proposed sewage treatment plant and equestrian staging area. These uses would need to incorporate measures to reduce the exposure of sensitive receptors to odors. Impacts and mitigation measures will be assessed in a technical analysis.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

- ☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The site is known to support several sensitive habitats, which support and have the potential to support endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species. The site supports the following sensitive habitats: southern riparian forest, southern riparian woodland, southern willow scrub, mule fat scrub, freshwater marsh, herbaceous wetland, disturbed wetland, pond, tamarisk scrub, coastal sage scrub, coast live oak woodland, southern mixed chaparral, non-native grassland, and field pasture. Pursuant to the CEQA and the Resource Protection Ordinance (in addition to state and federal laws), impacts to listed, or otherwise rare species must be minimized and often avoided entirely.

Therefore, based on the fact that the site has the potential to support several endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats, the project may have a potentially significant impact on biological resources. As such any potentially significant adverse effects, including noise from construction or the project, to endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats must be addressed in the context of the biological technical study and the EIR.

- b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?

- ☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The site supports a number of wetland habitats and wetland buffers that were identified on a site visit conducted by Beth Ehsan and Maggie Loy on March 11, 2013. These wetlands and wetland buffers may be significantly impacted by the proposed project and as proposed the project may not conform to the wetland and wetland buffer regulations within the Resource Protection Ordinance. Therefore, impacts to wetlands and

wetland buffers and conformance with the Resource Protection Ordinance must be demonstrated and discussed in the context of a biological technical study and the EIR.

- c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The site contains a number of significant drainages and wetland habitats, specifically, a primary tributary to Escondido Creek and several drainages that bisect the project site, which if impacted may result in significant alterations to known watersheds or wetlands that may be considered California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers jurisdictional wetlands or waters, and would potentially require a Section 1603 "Streambed Alteration Agreement" and/or 404 Permit. Therefore, all significant drainages and wetlands must be defined and impacts identified in a biological technical study and in the EIR.

- d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: Potential wildlife corridors exist throughout the project site along natural drainages through various sensitive habitats, including: Diegan coastal sage scrub, riparian areas and wetlands. The current project design may potentially impact these corridors and may create additional indirect impacts through increased noise and activity. Therefore, any potentially significant impacts to wildlife movement patterns, wildlife dispersal corridors, and use of native wildlife nursery sites must be discussed in the biological technical study and the EIR.

- e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The project is being reviewed for consistency with the Natural Communities Conservation Plan (HLP Ordinance and Planning Agreement), Habitat Management Plans (HMP), Special Area Management Plans (SAMP), the Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), and Habitat Loss Permit (HLP). Therefore, any potentially significant conflicts must be discussed in the biological technical study and the EIR.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: A number of historical resources have been identified within a mile radius of the site. As a result, the project may grade, disturb, or threaten a potentially significant historical artifact, object, structure, or site. Therefore, the potential for impacts to historic structures will be evaluated in the archaeological survey and discuss the survey results in the context of the EIR.

- b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: A number of archaeological resources have been identified within a mile radius of the site. As a result, the project may grade, disturb, or threaten a potentially significant archaeological or cultural artifact, object, structure, or site. Therefore, the project must complete an archaeological survey and discuss the survey results in the context of the EIR.

- c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: San Diego County has a variety of geologic environments and geologic processes which generally occur in other parts of the state, country, and the world. However, some features stand out as being unique in one way or another within the boundaries of the County. After review of the San Dieguito Community Plan and a site visit by Maggie Loy on March 11, 2013, it has been determined that the site does not contain any unique geologic features nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.

- d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on geological formations that potentially contain unique paleontological resources. Excavating into undisturbed ground beneath the soil horizons may cause a significant impact if unique paleontological resources are encountered. Since an

impact to paleontological resources does not typically occur until the resource is disturbed, monitoring during excavation is the essential measure to mitigate potentially significant impacts to unique paleontological resources to a level below significance. Therefore, the EIR must disclose the following information about the potential impacts to paleontological resources.

The project has low/marginal potential for containing paleontological resources and will excavate the substratum and/or bedrock below the soil horizons. A monitoring program implemented by the excavation/grading contractor will be required. Equipment operators and others involved in the excavation should watch for fossils during the normal course of their duties. In accordance with the Grading Ordinance, if a fossil or fossil assemblage of greater than twelve inches in any dimension is encountered during excavation, all excavation operations in the area where the fossil or fossil assemblage was found shall be suspended immediately, the County's Permit Compliance Coordinator shall be notified, and a Qualified Paleontologist shall be retained by the applicant to inspect the find to determine if it is significant. A Qualified Paleontologist is a person who has, to the satisfaction of the Planning and Land Use Director:

- A Ph.D. or M.S. or equivalent in paleontology or closely related field (e.g., sedimentary or stratigraphic geology, evolutionary biology, etc.);
- Demonstrated knowledge of southern California paleontology and geology; and
- Documented experience in professional paleontological procedures and techniques.

If the Qualified Paleontologist determines that the fossil or fossil assemblage is significant; a mitigation program involving salvage, cleaning, and curation of the fossil(s) and documentation shall be implemented. If no fossils or fossil assemblages of greater than 12 inches in any dimension are encountered during excavation, a "No Fossils Found" letter will be submitted to the County Planning & Development Services identifying who conducted the monitoring and that no fossils were found. If one or more fossils or fossil assemblages are found, the Qualified Paleontologist shall prepare a report documenting the mitigation program, including field and laboratory methodology, location and the geologic and stratigraphic setting, list(s) of collected fossils and their paleontological significance, descriptions of any analyses, conclusions, and references cited.

Therefore, with the implementation of the above project requirements during project grading operations, potential impacts to paleontological resources will be less than significant. Furthermore, the project will not result in a cumulative impact to paleontological resources because other projects that require grading in sensitive paleontological resource areas will be required to have the appropriate level of paleontological monitoring and resource recovery. In addition, other projects that propose any amount of significant grading would be subject to the requirements for paleontological monitoring as required pursuant to the County's Grading Ordinance. Therefore, the project would not result in a significant direct, indirect, or cumulatively significant loss of paleontological resources.

e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: A number of archaeological resources have been identified within a mile radius of the site. As a result, the project may grade, disturb, or threaten a potentially significant archaeological, historical, or cultural artifact, object, structure, or site. Therefore, the project must complete an archaeological survey and discuss the survey results in the context of the EIR.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

- i. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

No Impact: The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault. Therefore, there will be no impact from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from a known fault-rupture hazard zone as a result of this project.

- ii. Strong seismic ground shaking?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Less Than Significant Impact: Although the project site is not located in a hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, the project site is subject to ground shaking from seismic activity. To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. The County Code requires a soils compaction report with proposed foundation recommendations to be approved before the issuance of a building permit. Therefore, compliance with the California Building Code and the County Code ensures the project will not result in a potentially significant impact from the exposure of people or structures to potential adverse effects from strong seismic ground shaking. The EIR must include appropriate discussion and design measures to address this issue.

- iii. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The geology of the project site is identified as both plutonic and marine/nonmarine sedimentary deposits. The sedimentary deposits are susceptible to ground failure including liquefaction from seismic activity. Feasible foundation designs exist that can mitigate the liquefaction hazard (including liquefaction-induced lateral spreading). A geotechnical study shall be reviewed and approved which specifies foundation design adequate to preclude substantial damage to the proposed structures due to liquefaction. With a site-specific engineering design, impacts due to liquefaction would be less than significant. Therefore, there is a less than significant impact from the exposure of people to adverse effects from a known area susceptible to ground failure.

iv. Landslides?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
 ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 ☐ No Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: Portions of the site are located within a landslide susceptibility zone and a significant impact may result from the exposure of people or structures to adverse effects from an area susceptible to landslides. A Geotechnical Report has been required and the EIR must include appropriate discussion and measures required in order to determine if either pre-existing or potential conditions are present that could become unstable in the event of seismic activity.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact
 ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☒ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated
 ☐ No Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as follows:

Soil Type		Erosion Index
VaB	Visalia sandy loam, 2 to 5% slopes	Severe 16
VsC	Visalia coarse sandy loam, 5 to 9% slopes	Moderate 2
ChB	Chino fine sandy loam, 2 to 5% slopes	Severe 16
CmE2	Cienega rocky coarse sandy loam, 9 to 30% slopes	Severe 16
CmrG	Cienega very rocky coarse sandy loam, 30 to 75% slopes	Severe 1
EsD2	Escondido very fine sandy loam, 9 to 15% slopes	Severe 16
FvD & E	Fallbrook-Vista sandy loams, 15 to 30% slopes	Severe 16
HrC	Huerhuero loam, 2 to 9% slopes	Severe 9
LpD2	Las Posas fine sandy loam, 9 to 15% slopes, eroded	Moderate 2
PfC	Placentia sandy loam, thick surface, 2 to 9% slopes	Severe 16
WmB	Wyman loam, 2 to 5% slopes	Moderate 2

These soils have a soil erodibility rating of "moderate" or "severe" as indicated by the Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The proposed project may result in unprotected erodible soils, may alter existing drainage patterns, may be located a wetland or significant drainage feature, and may develop steep slopes. Even though, the project is required to comply with the Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING) of Division 7, EXCAVATION AND GRADING, of the San Diego County Zoning and Land Use Regulations, erosion potential from the project must be discussed in the context of the EIR and include measures under the following categories:

- The project will not result in unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes.
- The project has prepared a Storm water Management Plan that includes Best Management Practices (BMPs) to ensure sediment does not erode from the project site:
- The project involves grading. However, the project is required to comply with the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING). Compliance with these regulations minimizes the potential for water and wind erosion.

It is not expected that the project will contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact because all cumulative projects that involve grading or land disturbance are required to follow the requirements of the San Diego County Code of Regulations, Title 8, Zoning and Land Use Regulations, Division 7, Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING); Order 2001-01 (NPDES No. CAS 0108758), adopted by the San Diego Region RWQCB on February 21, 2001; County Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ord. No. 9424); and County Storm Water Standards Manual adopted on February 20, 2002, and amended January 10, 2003 (Ordinance No. 9426).

- c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The proposed project involves grading that would result in the creation of areas of cut and areas underlain by fill. In order to assure that any proposed buildings (including those proposed on the project site) are adequately supported (whether on native soils, cut or fill), a Soils Engineering Report is required as part of the Building Permit process. This Report would evaluate the strength of underlying soils and make recommendations on the design of building foundation systems. The Soils Engineering Report must demonstrate that a proposed building meets the structural stability standards required by the California Building Code. The report must be approved by the County prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. Additionally, sedimentary deposits at the site have the potential to be susceptible to liquefaction. Mitigation measures for any structures, roadways, or other improvements will be required to be addressed in the geotechnical investigation being prepared for the project. With mitigation for liquefaction and a standard required soils engineering report for the project, impacts would be less than significant. For further information regarding landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading, refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., iii-iv listed above. For further information regarding landslides, liquefaction, and lateral spreading, refer to VI Geology and Soils, Question a., iii-iv listed above.

- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant Impact: The project is located on expansive soils as defined within Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). This was confirmed by staff review of the

Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, prepared by the US Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation and Forest Service dated December 1973. The soils on-site are Las Posas, Huerhuero, Placentia, and Wyman loams with high and moderate shrink/swell characteristics. However the project will not have any significant impacts because the project is required to comply with the improvement requirements identified in the 1997 Uniform Building Code, Division III – Design Standard for Design of Slab-On-Ground Foundations to Resist the Effects of Expansive Soils and Compressible Soils, which ensure suitable structure safety in areas with expansive soils. Therefore, these soils will not create substantial risks to life or property.

- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

No Impact: The project will rely on public water and sewer for the disposal of wastewater. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:

- a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions are said to result in an increase in the earth's average surface temperature commonly referred to as global warming. This rise in global temperature is associated with long-term changes in precipitation, temperature, wind patterns, and other elements of the earth's climate system, known as climate change. These changes are now broadly attributed to GHG emissions, particularly those emissions that result from the human production and use of fossil fuels. GHGs of concern from the project include carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide, among others.

The County has prepared *Draft Guidelines for Determining Significance* and *Draft Report Format and Content Requirements* for addressing climate change in CEQA documents. The County has also prepared a Draft Climate Action Plan (CAP) that includes GHG reduction measures that, if fully implemented, would achieve an emissions reduction target that is consistent with the state-mandated reduction target embodied in AB 32.

The Guidelines contain screening criteria for a range of project types and sizes to identify smaller projects that would have less-than-cumulatively considerable GHG emissions impacts. If a proposed project is the same type and equal to or smaller than the project size listed in the Guidelines, it is presumed that construction and operational GHG emissions for that project would not exceed 2,500 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO₂e) per year, and there would be a less-than-cumulatively considerable impact. If the project is of a type or size that does not comply with the screening criteria, the project should incorporate all applicable CAP measures and estimate emissions relative to one of the quantified implementing thresholds: Efficiency Threshold, Bright Line Threshold, Stationary Source Threshold, or Performance Threshold.

The project proposes a private gated residential development of 362 residential lots and 17 open space lots and easements of 109 acres, with preservation of both agriculture and native habitats. The screening criterion for single family housing is 86 dwelling units. Therefore, GHG emissions from the project could have a cumulatively considerable impact. A technical analysis needs to be performed to demonstrate that the project's design features, along with relevant CAP measure(s) and, if necessary, additional feasible mitigation measures, are incorporated that would allow the project to be below the chosen implementing threshold.

- b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: As discussed in (a) above, the project is above the screening criterion for single family housing developments and could have a cumulatively considerable impact with respect to GHG emissions. Development projects that could have cumulatively considerable GHG emissions impacts need to incorporate relevant measures from the County's CAP and use one of the implementing thresholds from the Significance Guidelines-Efficiency Threshold, Bright Line Threshold, Stationary Source Threshold, or Performance Threshold-to assess significance. The project's consistency with the CAP and County Guidelines needs to be assessed through a technical analysis.

VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS -- Would the project:

- a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project proposes an onsite tertiary sewage treatment plant which involves the routine use and storage of hazardous materials. However, the project will be considered and evaluated for storage, handling, transport, emission and disposal of hazardous substances. Operation would require full compliance with local, State, and Federal regulations. California Government Code § 65850.2 requires that no final certificate of occupancy or its substantial equivalent be issued unless there is verification that the owner or authorized agent has met, or is meeting, the applicable requirements of the Health and Safety Code, Division 20, Chapter 6.95, Article 2, Section 25500-25520. The EIR will disclose and analyze any potential hazardous materials associated with the operation of the plant, which will have ongoing regulations by a major use permit.

The project proposes to demolish or renovate structures on site that were constructed prior to 1980 and that may contain Lead Based Paint (LBP) and Asbestos Containing Materials (ACMs). Lead is a highly toxic metal that was used up until 1978 in paint used on walls, woodwork, siding, windows and doors. Lead containing materials shall be managed by applicable regulations including, at a minimum, the hazardous waste disposal requirements (Title 22 CCR Division 4.5, the worker health and safety requirements (Title 8 CCR Section 1532.1) and the

State Lead Accreditation, Certification, and Work Practice Requirements (Title 17 CCR Division 1, Chapter 8). Asbestos was used extensively from the 1940's until the late 1970's in the construction industry for fireproofing, thermal and acoustic insulation, condensation control, and decoration. The USEPA has determined that there is no "safe" exposure level to asbestos. It is therefore highly regulated by the USEPA, CalEPA, and the CalOSHA. Demolition or renovation operations that involve asbestos-containing materials must conform to San Diego Air Pollution Control District (SDAPCD) Rules 361.140-361.156. In accordance with existing regulations, the project will be required to complete asbestos and lead surveys to determine the presence or absence of ACMs or LBP prior to issuance of a building permit that includes demolition of onsite structures and prior to commencement of demolition or renovation activities.

While the Phase I ESAs were negative for USTs and ASTs, destruction of existing septic systems and wells will be completed by the San Diego County Department of Environmental Health (DEH). DEH Hazardous Materials Division (DEH HMD) would be involved if underground tanks are discovered during grading as part of the Certified Unified Program Agency (CUPA) for San Diego County responsible for enforcing Chapter 6.95 of the Health and Safety Code. As the CUPA, the DEH HMD is required to regulate hazardous materials business plans and chemical inventory, hazardous waste and tiered permitting, underground storage tanks, and risk management plans. The Hazardous Materials Business Plan is required to contain basic information on the location, type, quantity and health risks of hazardous materials stored, used, or disposed of onsite. The plan also contains an emergency response plan which describes the procedures for mitigating a hazardous release, procedures and equipment for minimizing the potential damage of a hazardous materials release, and provisions for immediate notification of the HMD, the Office of Emergency Services, and other emergency response personnel such as the local Fire Agency having jurisdiction. Implementation of the emergency response plan facilitates rapid response in the event of an accidental spill or release, thereby reducing potential adverse impacts. Furthermore, the DEH HMD is required to conduct ongoing routine inspections to ensure compliance with existing laws and regulations; to identify safety hazards that could cause or contribute to an accidental spill or release; and to suggest preventative measures to minimize the risk of a spill or release of hazardous substances.

Therefore, due to the strict requirements that regulate hazardous substances outlined above and the fact that the initial planning, ongoing monitoring, and inspections will occur in compliance with local, State, and Federal regulation; the project will not result in any potentially significant impacts related to the routine transport, use, and disposal of hazardous substances or related to the accidental explosion or release of hazardous substances.

- b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

No Impact: The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. Therefore, the project will not have any effect on an existing or proposed school.

- c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
--	---

- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: Based on a site visit by Geocon (2011, 2012), and a regulatory database search, the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. The project site is not included in any of the following lists or databases: the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5., the San Diego County Hazardous Materials Establishment database, the San Diego County DEH Site Assessment and Mitigation (SAM) Case Listing, the Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) Site Mitigation and Brownfields Reuse Program Database ("CalSites" Envirostor Database), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Information System (RCRIS) listing, the EPA's Superfund CERCLIS database or the EPA's National Priorities List (NPL). Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site (FUDS), and does not contain a leaking Underground Storage Tank. However, the site does have the potential for contamination from historic agricultural use. Additional soil testing is required to determine whether the site is subject to contamination that would create a hazard to the future residents.

- d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- ☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The project is located within the Airport Influence Area (AIA) 2 for the Palomar McClellan Airport, which is 8.4 miles to the west. The AIA 2 portion of the project is an overflight notification area and requires FAA notification for hazards to airport safety. That process requires the applicant to file notice to FAA under 14 Code of Federal Regulations, part 77 pursuant to 49 U.S.C., Section 44718 (the highest topographic point of the proposed project with the tallest potential structure allowed by the proposed zoning height designator). FAA makes a determination if the proposed land use action is a potential hazard. If the action is a potential hazard, the County would need to submit an application for a consistency determination from the San Diego Regional Airport Authority (RAA). AIA 2 also requires evidence of an overflight agreement prior to issuing building permits for residences, in compliance with the AIA 2 and site zoning (special "C" designator).

- e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

- ☐ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☒ No Impact

No Impact: The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip. As a result, the project will not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

The following sections summarize the project's consistency with applicable emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans.

i. OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN:

Less Than Significant Impact: The Operational Area Emergency Plan is a comprehensive emergency plan that defines responsibilities, establishes an emergency organization, defines lines of communications, and is designed to be part of the statewide Standardized Emergency Management System. The Operational Area Emergency Plan provides guidance for emergency planning and requires subsequent plans to be established by each jurisdiction that has responsibilities in a disaster situation. The Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan includes an overview of the risk assessment process, identifies hazards present in the jurisdiction, hazard profiles, and vulnerability assessments. The plan also identifies goals, objectives and actions for each jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, including all cities and the County unincorporated areas. The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.

ii. SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The San Diego County Nuclear Power Station Emergency Response Plan will not be interfered with by the project due to the location of the project, plant and the specific requirements of the plan. The emergency plan for the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station includes an emergency planning zone within a 10-mile radius. All land area within 10 miles of the plant is not within the jurisdiction of the unincorporated County and as such a project in the unincorporated area is not expected to interfere with any response or evacuation.

iii. OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT

No Impact: The Oil Spill Contingency Element will not be interfered with because the project is not located along the coastal zone or coastline.

iv. EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN

No Impact: The Emergency Water Contingencies Annex and Energy Shortage Response Plan will not be interfered with because the project does not propose altering major water or energy supply infrastructure, such as the California Aqueduct.

v. DAM EVACUATION PLAN

No Impact: No Dam Evacuation Plan will be interfered with because the project is not located within a dam inundation zone.

- g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. The project may increase the fire hazard if the project is unable to comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code for the Fire Protection Districts in San Diego County, as adopted and amended by the local fire protection district, or in the County Fire Code, depending on the best agency selected for fire service. The project will have requirements to ensure that the project will be in compliance with relevant Fire Codes such that the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires. Compliance with all the fire requirements and specific details of the project's design consideration must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

- h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project includes an existing pond that allows water to stand for a period of 72 hours (3 days) or more. It also includes a staging area for equestrians. These two aspects of the project may increase the risk of vectors (mosquitoes and flies) that could result in injury or death to people in the vicinity. A Vector Management Plan must be developed and approved by the County Department of Environmental Health, Vector Surveillance Program to ensure people will not be exposed to vectors. The Vector Management Plan will be discussed in the context of the EIR and analyses.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

- a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project is required to comply with all waste discharge requirements; however, additional analysis is required to demonstrate compliance. A discussion of special site design considerations, source control Best Management Practices (BMPs) and treatment control BMPs, under the San Diego Municipal Storm Water Permit (SDRWQCB Order No. R9-2007-0001) as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP), and compliance with any other waste discharge requirements must be discussed as a part of the EIR, Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) and technical study for hydrology as appropriate.

- b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project lies in the Escondido hydrologic subarea, within the Carlsbad hydrologic unit - that is impaired for Coliform bacteria, nutrients, and sediment and may result in an increase of pollutants for which the water body is already impaired. This potential increase must be discussed as a part of the EIR, SWMP and technical study for hydrology as appropriate.

- c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project is not anticipated to create or contribute runoff water that would cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives; however, this cannot be determined with the current information available for the proposed project. As a result, applicable surface or groundwater water quality objectives must be discussed as a part of the EIR, SWMP and technical study for hydrology as appropriate.

- d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The project will obtain its water supply from the Rincon del Diablo Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported water source. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation, domestic or commercial demands. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge including, but not limited to the following: the project does not involve regional diversion of water to another groundwater basin; or diversion or channelization of a stream course or waterway with impervious layers, such as concrete lining or culverts, for substantial distances (e.g. ¼ mile). These activities and operations can substantially affect rates of groundwater recharge. Therefore, no impact to groundwater resources is anticipated.

- e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project could alter the existing drainage pattern of the area, through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation because of the substantial grading that is proposed. The applicant will be required to design the project to meet the performance standards of the WPO for flow control and erosion, and surface and ground water quality. Conformance to the WPO must be demonstrated in the context of the EIR, SWMP and technical study for hydrology as appropriate.

- f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The proposed project could significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff. The project could have adverse effect on drainage patterns or the rate or amount of runoff because it could significantly impair, impede or accelerate flow in a watercourse or increase erosion or siltation. The project could have significant flood hazards from external sources. The applicant will be required to show lines of inundation to the 100-year flood on the existing watercourse that flows through the property, which will identify the area not to be used or disturbed. Drainage along roads shall be per County Standards. Building pads will be shown on the plat as located outside the lines of inundation for the 100-year flood plain. The project will be required to address the above-mentioned issues and through a hydrology study be required to identify and analyze any impacts and address appropriate mitigation. Also, these issues are required to be discussed in the EIR.

- g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The proposed project could contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems because it proposes significant alteration of the site's landforms and will significantly increase the amount of runoff from impervious surfaces. Therefore, the project could cause significant flood hazards downstream of the site. The project must comply with applicable ordinances and regulations related to storm water and technical reports must be prepared to demonstrate compliance (HMP and SWMP) These issues will be identified and analyzed in the EIR.

- h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The project may involve potential sources of polluted runoff. Therefore, the project must discuss proposed site design measures

and/or source control BMP's and/or treatment control BMP's to be employed to reduce potential pollutants in runoff to the maximum extent practicable and to ensure compliance with applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses in the context of the EIR and technical reports (HMP and SWMP).

- i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

No Impact: The drainage swales found onsite are not mapped on a FEMA floodplain map or as a County Floodplain.

- j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: Drainage swales, which have a watershed greater than 25 acres occur on the project site and may occur in off-site improvement locations. These areas mapped with a watershed greater than 25 acres have been avoided for placement of structures, such as access roads and other improvements, which may impede or redirect flood flows will be evaluated in the context of the EIR. Potential impacts from flood hazards will be identified and discussed within the EIR.

- k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Less than Significant Impact: The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area. However, drainage swales, which have a watershed greater than 25 acres occur on the project site and may occur on off-site improvement locations. The proposed residential lots are located at an elevation that would prevent exposure of people or property to flooding. A Drainage Study will be done and presented in the context of the EIR, and flood prevention measures will be incorporated to reduce the risk for people or structures to be exposed to loss injury or death by flooding.

- l) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

i. SEICHE

No Impact: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir; therefore, could not be inundated by a seiche.

ii. TSUNAMI

No Impact: Tsunami – The project site is located more than a mile from the coast; therefore, in the event of a tsunami, would not be inundated.

iii. MUDFLOW

Potentially Significant Impact: Mudflow is type of landslide. The site is located within a "Generally Susceptible" landslide susceptibility zone. However, potential impacts due to landslide and mudflow will be identified and discussed within the EIR and the Geotechnical Report.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide (or isolate) an established community?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project is a new residential community with infrastructure (roadways, water supply systems, and utilities) in the Eden Valley community, currently characterized by one to four acre residential lots, many including agricultural and equestrian uses. The project is located on approximately 200 acres of land with the City of San Marcos to the east, the City of Escondido to the north, Eden Valley to the west, and Harmony Grove Village to the south. While the site is mostly vacant at this time, 362 dwelling units, two community areas, a public equestrian staging area and trails are proposed. The degree to which the proposed development would physically isolate the existing semi-rural Eden Valley community will be studied within the EIR.

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: A GPA, Specific Plan, and Rezone to change approximately 200 acres from SR-2 and SR-1 to SR-0.5 are proposed. The proposed land use designation of semi-rural 0.5 would allow a more dense development with 0.5 to 2 dwellings per acre on a slope dependant scale.

Zoning Ordinance: The following uses are allowed under the current and the proposed zoning: a. Residential Use Types: Family Residential; b. Civic Use Types: Essential Services. Fire Protection Services; c. Agricultural Use Types: Horticulture: Cultivation, Tree Crops, Row and Field Crops. Other uses could be permitted with a minor or major use permit. The SR Use Regulations are intended to create and enhance residential areas where agricultural use is compatible with a dominant, permanent residential use is desired. Typically, the SR Use

Regulations would be applied to semi-rural areas where urban levels of service are not available and where transitional or large lots are desired. Various applications of the SR Use Regulations with appropriate development designators can create buffers between residential and agricultural uses, family or small farm areas, or large lot rural residential developments (Zoning Ordinance, Sec. 2180).

Land Use Element: Changes in land use designations must be reviewed in the context of all relevant goals and policies of the General Plan and San Dieguito Community Plan and compliance with County Ordinances and Board of Supervisors' Policies, including limiting extension of urban services into the Semi-Rural and Rural Areas of the County. The preliminary list of goals and policies that will be examined in the context of the EIR includes:

General Plan Guiding Principle 3: Reinforce the vitality, local economy, and individual character of existing communities when planning new housing, employment, and recreational opportunities.

General Plan Policy LU-1.3: Assign land use designations in patterns to create or enhance communities and preserve rural lands.

General Plan Policy LU-2.3: Assign densities and minimum lot sizes in a manner that is compatible with the character of each unincorporated community.

General Plan Policy LU-2.5: Identify and maintain greenbelts between communities to reinforce the identity of individual communities. Maintain continuous open space areas where possible to serve as greenbelts through the site.

General Plan Policy LU-3.1 and 3.2: Support a diversity of residential designations and building types and a mix of housing units in large projects. Also see H-1.8

General Plan Policy LU-6.9: Require developments to conform to the natural topography to limit grading; incorporate and do not significantly alter the dominant physical characteristic of a site.

General Plan Policy LU-5.2: Incorporate into new development sustainable planning and design (comply with County's Climate Action Plan).

General Plan Policy LU-5.3: Ensure the preservation of forested areas, agricultural lands, wildlife habitat and corridors, wetlands, watersheds, and groundwater recharge areas when permitting development under the Rural and Semi-Rural Land Use Designations.

General Plan Policy LU-7.1: Protect agricultural lands with lower-density land use designations that support continued agricultural operations.

General Plan Policy LU-10.1: Require residential development in Semi-Rural areas to be integrated with existing neighborhoods by providing connected and continuous street, pathway/trail, and recreational open space networks.

General Plan Policy LU-14.4: Require sewer systems to be planned, developed, and sized to serve the land use pattern and densities depicted on the Land Use Map. Sewer systems and services shall not be extended beyond either Village boundaries or extant Urban Limit Lines, whichever is more restrictive, except for... conservation subdivisions.

General Plan Policy S-6.4: The General Plan requires that new development demonstrate that fire services can meet minimum travel times. The Goal for the proposed density of the project is five minutes travel time.

General Plan Policy S-11.5: Require development adjacent to existing agricultural operations in Semi-Rural and Rural Lands to adequately buffer agricultural areas and ensure compliance with relevant safety codes where pesticides or other hazardous materials are used.

General Plan Policy H-1.9: Require developers to provide an affordable housing component when requesting a General Plan amendment for a large-scale residential project.

General Plan Policy M-4.6: Coordinate with adjacent jurisdictions so that roads within Spheres of Influence (SOIs) or that cross jurisdictional boundaries are designed to provide a consistent cross-section and capacity.

General Plan Policy M-9.4: Require developers of large projects to provide, or to contribute to, park-and-ride facilities near freeway interchanges and other appropriate locations that provide convenient access to congested regional arterials.

General Plan Policy COS-15.1: Require that new buildings be designed and constructed in accordance with "green building" programs that incorporate techniques and materials that maximize energy efficiency, incorporate the use of sustainable resources and recycled materials, and reduce emissions of GHGs and toxic air contaminants.

Community Plan/Harmony Grove SP Policy LU-1.5.1: Require minimum lot sizes of two acres outside the Village Boundary as the standard unless significant preservation of resources is achieved and specific findings are met for the preservation of community character.

Community Plan/Harmony Grove SP Policy LU-1.5.3 and 1.9.2: Provide for lot sizes that will permit residents to keep leisure and market animals on their property and encourage the keeping of equestrian and market animals.

Board Policy I-73 (Hillside Development): Proposed hillside development must be given a special type of analysis and review under Section 66474 of the Government Code (Subdivision Map Act) which requires that the Board of Supervisors disapprove a subdivision if the site is not physically suitable for the proposed density of development.

Board Policy I-78 (Small Wastewater Treatment Facilities): This policy requires sewer systems to be planned, developed, and sized to serve the land use pattern and densities depicted on the General Plan Land Use Map.

In addition, because the project is outside of the existing Sanitation District boundary, it will require annexation and approval by LAFCO. LAFCO is a CEQA "Responsible Agency" and will make its annexation determinations relying upon the project's certified EIR. Therefore, the EIR must consider appropriate LAFCO policies and impact analysis related to the provision of services under LAFCO's purview.

The EIR must also discuss compliance with ordinances and regulations applicable to the project, including but not limited to:

County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance

County of San Diego Stormwater and Watershed Protection Ordinances

County of San Diego Habitat Loss Permit Ordinance (NCCP)
County of San Diego Noise Ordinance
Climate Action Plan
State and local fire regulations.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Less than Significant Impact: The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1997) as an area of “Potential Mineral Resource Significance” (MRZ-3). However, the project site flanks a residential area which is incompatible to future extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, implementation of the project will not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value since the mineral resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

- b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact

No Impact: The project site is not located in an area that has MRZ-2 designated lands, nor is it located within 1,300 feet of such lands. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of locally important mineral resource(s). Therefore, no potentially significant loss of availability of a known mineral resource of locally important mineral resource recovery (extraction) site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan will occur as a result of this project.

XII. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

- a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The project is a large residential subdivision and will involve major grading and construction activities. The surrounding area supports residential and open space land and the project may expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element

The County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, Tables N-1 and N-2 addresses noise sensitive areas and requires an acoustical study to be prepared for any use that may expose noise sensitive area to noise in excess of a Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) of 60 decibels (dBA). Moreover, if the project is in excess of 60 dBA CNEL or 65 dBA CNEL, modifications must be made to project to reduce noise levels. Noise sensitive areas include residences, hospitals, schools, libraries or similar facilities as mentioned within Tables N-1 and N-2.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.404

Non-transportation noise generated by the sewage treatment plant may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.404) at or beyond the property lines. The proposed zoning and the location of the noise sources will be evaluated for compliance.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36.409

Construction noise may exceed the standards of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409). Construction operations would be expected to occur during permitted hours of operation pursuant to Section 36.409, but areas of blasting may be required and an evaluation of construction equipment noise that may be in excess of an average sound level of 75dB between the hours of 7 AM and 7 PM must be done.

To determine conformance, a Noise Analysis must be completed for the project and must be discussed in the EIR.

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

No Impact: The project does not propose any of the following land uses that can be impacted by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.

1. Buildings where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation, including research and manufacturing facilities with special vibration constraints.
2. Residences and buildings where people normally sleep including hotels, hospitals, and where low ambient vibration is preferred.
3. Civic and institutional land uses including schools, churches, libraries, other institutions, and quiet office where low ambient vibration is preferred.
4. Concert halls for symphonies or other special use facilities where low ambient vibration is preferred.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on-site or in the surrounding area.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Incorporated

Potentially Significant Impact: The project site is adjacent to Country Club Drive and may be impacted by noise from this Circulation Element roadway. In addition, the project proposes a wastewater treatment plant, which may have potential noise generation impacts.

Policy 4b of the Noise Element of the General Plan specifies that "whenever it appears that new development will result in any (existing or future) noise sensitive area being subjected to noise levels of CNEL equal to 60 decibels or greater, an acoustical study should be required". The Noise Element defines "noise sensitive area" as "the building site of any residence, hospital, school, library, or similar facility where quiet is an important attribute of the environment." To determine conformance a Noise Analysis must be completed for the project and must be discussed in the EIR.

- d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Incorporated	

Potentially Significant Impact: Although construction operations will occur only during permitted hours of operation, potential impacts may occur if construction noise limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Section 36.409), are exceeded. The facility also supports noise generating equipment required for the sewage treatment plant. To determine conformance, a Noise Analysis must be completed for the project and must be discussed in the EIR.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Incorporated	

No Impact: The northern third of the project site is located within the "Airport Influence Area 2" for the McClellan-Palomar Airport which is 8.4 miles west. This designation does not place any limitations on proposed residential uses and would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Incorporated	

No Impact: The proposed project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip; therefore, the project will not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive airport-related noise levels.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

- a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

☒ Potential Impact

☐ No Impact

Potential Impact: Growth induction is a change in physical circumstance or regulatory issues that would remove a restriction to or encourage an increase in human population or development. A project can be determined to have a growth-inducing impact if it directly or indirectly causes economic or population expansion through the removal of obstacles to growth, actions that are sometimes referred to as "growth accommodating."

Growth is not considered positive or negative in itself, but is an element of the project that must be analyzed through the physical environmental changes it causes. The proposed project includes the following aspects which may be determined to be growth inducing: whether approval of the proposed general plan amendment requires additional upgrades in land use regulatory plans such as the Mobility Element; whether approval of the project requires major improvements to road circulation, extension of water, gas, and electric lines, or installation and operation of a new sewage treatment facility with capacity to serve additional properties. Growth induction can result in a wide variety of potential impacts, which must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

- b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☒ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

☐ No Impact

Less Than Significant Impact: The property currently has one occupied home, which, even though it would be demolished, would be replaced by the proposed housing development. Potentially a total of 362 single-family dwellings will exist when the lots are developed.

- c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐ Potentially Significant Impact

☒ Less than Significant Impact

☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated

☐ No Impact

The property currently has one occupied home, which will be demolished when the project is implemented. This residential development would not displace substantial numbers of people associated with the existing structures. Potentially a total of 362 single-family dwellings will exist when the lots are developed. Therefore, the proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

- a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or

other performance service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- i. Fire protection?
- ii. Police protection?
- iii. Schools?
- iv. Parks?
- v. Other public facilities?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes to receive water service from the Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water District. Facilities to serve the project are reasonably expected to be available within the next five years based on the capital facility plan of the district.

The project proposes to annex to the County Sanitation District for operation and maintenance of the proposed wastewater treatment facility. The project is required to provide an infrastructure study, as well as a policy analysis to determine the feasibility of the proposal for sewer service.

The project is located within the Escondido Union School District and the Escondido Union High School District and it is eligible for service. Impacts to school facilities will be avoided by the payment of fees pursuant to State Law prior to the issuance of Building Permits.

The Sheriff's office reviewed the project and determined that based on the currently accepted standard 1 patrol position per 10,000 population, or 0.53 sworn officers per 1,000 people, and the current census figures of 2.79 residents per household in the County, this project would require the assignment of 0.5 additional officers. The San Marcos Station has adequate space to absorb this additional staff and no new facilities or expansion of facilities would be needed as a result of this development.

The sewer service annexation and the ability of the districts to serve the project must be evaluated in the EIR and be adequate for the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) and the serving districts to use for their environmental determinations. The physical environmental changes that would result from extending service to the project site may result in significant impacts and in growth. As a result, relevant technical analyses for the provision of public services will be presented in the context of the EIR.

XV. RECREATION

- a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The project involves a residential subdivision that will increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities. To avoid substantial physical deterioration of local recreation facilities the project will be required to pay fees or dedicate land for local parks to the County pursuant to the Park Land Dedication

Ordinance (PLDO). The Park Land Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) is the mechanism that enables the funding or dedication of local parkland in the County. The PLDO establishes several methods by which developers may satisfy their park requirements. Options include the payment of park fees, the dedication of a public park, the provision of private recreational facilities, or a combination of these methods. PLDO funds must be used for the acquisition, planning, and development of local parkland and recreation facilities. Local parks are intended to serve the recreational needs of the communities in which they are located. The project is currently proposing an equestrian staging area and public trails that may be eligible for partial participation, but no public parks. The EIR will include an evaluation of the local and regional parks' ability to meet current and future needs of the project and the vicinity.

- b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The project includes a private community center, pocket open space, and public trails and with an equestrian staging area. However, as outlined in this Environmental Analysis Form, the new facilities will be evaluated in the EIR.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

- a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The County of San Diego Guidelines for Determining Significance for Traffic and Transportation (Guidelines) establish measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system. These Guidelines incorporate standards from the County of San Diego Public Road Standards and Mobility Element, the County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Program and the Congestion Management Program.

The proposed project is calculated to generate 4,430 ADT, with a total of 354 trips during the AM peak hour (106 inbound/248 outbound trips) and 443 total trips during PM peak hour (310 inbound/133 outbound) and it may have impacts related to performance measures and measures of effectiveness of the circulation system, as adopted by the Mobility Element (August 2011). These trips will be distributed on Mobility Element roadways in the County some of which currently or are projected to operate at inadequate levels of service. Therefore, the project will have a direct impact related to a conflict with policies establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system.

The preliminary traffic study identified that the project would not result in direct traffic impacts. However, based on future study and review, the project's added traffic may result in direct impacts to Country Club Drive. The traffic study identified significant cumulative traffic impacts to County roadway facilities and roadway facilities located within the Cities of Escondido and

San Marcos's jurisdictions. The project will also add traffic to Caltrans facilities located within the Cities of Escondido and San Marcos's jurisdictions that are projected to operate at LOS E/F in the cumulative scenario. Based on future study and review, the project's added traffic may result in additional traffic impacts.

The County of San Diego has developed an overall programmatic solution that addresses existing and projected future road deficiencies in the unincorporated portion of San Diego County. However, the project is a General Plan Amendment and is not eligible to participate in the TIF program, which was created as a mechanism to proportionally fund improvements to roadways necessary to mitigate potential cumulative impacts caused by traffic from planned future development. TIF was based on SANDAG regional growth and land use forecasts as analyzed in the SANDAG Regional Transportation Model and projected to build-out (year 2030) development conditions on the existing Mobility Element roadway network throughout the unincorporated area of the County. Since the project increases the ADT that would occur in the future, the model does not accurately determine funding necessary to construct transportation facilities that will mitigate cumulative impacts from this new development. Cumulative traffic must be assessed separately and mitigated on a project specific basis. Payment of the TIF, required at issuance of building permits, may be a part of adequate mitigation, but analysis must demonstrate the adequacy of this mitigation in combination with other components of a mitigation program. As a result, the EIR and Traffic Analysis are required to analyze the impact of the traffic generated by the project on County, City, and State roads in the area.

- b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated | <input type="checkbox"/> No Impact |

Potentially Significant Impact: The designated congestion management agency for the San Diego region is SANDAG. SANDAG is responsible for preparing the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) of which the Congestion Management Program (CMP) is an element to monitor transportation system performance, develop programs to address near- and long-term congestion, and better integrate land use and transportation planning decisions. The CMP includes a requirement for enhanced CEQA review applicable to certain large developments that generate an equivalent of 2,400 or more average daily vehicle trips or 200 or more peak hour vehicle trips. These large projects must complete a traffic analysis that identifies the project's impacts on CMP system roadways, their associated costs, and identify appropriate mitigation. Early project coordination with affected public agencies, the Metropolitan Transit System (MTS) and the North County Transit District (NCTD) is required to ensure that the impacts of new development on CMP transit performance measures are identified. The addition of the project's traffic may result in a substantial increase in the number of vehicle trips, volume of capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections in relation to existing conditions. Therefore, the proposal could result in a potential degradation of the level of service standard established by the County congestion management agency for designated roads or highways. As a result the EIR and Traffic Analysis are required to analyze the impact of the traffic generated by the project on County & State roads in the area.

- c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that result in substantial safety risks?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact | <input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact |
|---|---|

- ☒ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated: The main compatibility concerns for the protection of airport airspace are related to airspace obstructions (building height, antennas, etc.) and hazards to flight (wildlife attractants, distracting lighting or glare, etc.). The proposed project is within the designated Airport Influence Area 2 (AIA 2) for McClellan-Palomar Airport, but is located outside of the safety zones and is 8.4 miles east of the airport. Therefore, the proposed project, while unlikely to be "potentially significant", may require "mitigation to avoid a significant impact" on air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks. According to 14 Code of Federal Regulations, part 77 pursuant to 49 U.S.C., Section 44718, the FAA must make a determination if the residential land use action is a potential hazard. If the action is a potential hazard, the County would need to submit an application for a consistency determination from the RAA. The proposed residential land use in AIA 2 also requires an overflight notification for the airport. Airport hazards are also discussed in section VIII.e, Hazards and Hazardous Materials. Additional discussion related to these actions will occur in the context of the EIR.

- d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

- ☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The Traffic Analysis must demonstrate safe and adequate sight distance of driveways and intersections and propose improvements in accordance with County of San Diego Public and Private Road Standards. Depending of the extent and access of the proposed equestrian staging area, some accommodations may have to be made for entry by trailers. Operational and construction traffic must have analysis for traffic hazards and adequate sight distance. As a result the EIR and Traffic Analysis are required to analyze potential traffic hazards.

- e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

- ☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: A Fire Protection Plan (FPP) will be prepared for the proposed project. The San Marcos Fire Protection District, which is the Fire Authority Having Jurisdiction, and the San Diego County Fire Authority, must approve the proposed project and associated emergency access roadways to determine that access to the project does not exceed the maximum cumulative dead-end road length specified in the San Diego County Consolidated Fire Code. The fire station or stations serving the project also must meet County standards for emergency travel time to the site. The Fire Protection Plan is expected to identify mitigation measures or design features that will reduce potentially significant impacts. However, the issue must be discussed in the context of the EIR.

- f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

- ☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact

- ☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: Project implementation will result in construction of road improvements that may interfere with the provision of public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. In addition, the project may generate travel demand for transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities. Therefore, the project EIR must discuss compatibility with policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

- a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

- ☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes to utilize a new package sewage treatment system for effluent treatment/disposal. Processed and discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. Potential environmental impacts must be addressed within the appropriate technical studies and analyzed in the EIR.

- b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- c) ☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes to utilize a new package sewage treatment system for effluent treatment/disposal. Processed and discharged wastewater must conform to the Regional Water Quality Control Board's (RWQCB) applicable standards, including the Regional Basin Plan and the California Water Code. Potential environmental impacts must be addressed within the appropriate technical studies and analyzed in the EIR.

- d) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

- ☒ Potentially Significant Impact ☐ Less than Significant Impact
☐ Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated ☐ No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The project includes new stormwater drainage facilities. Moreover, the project involves landform modification including source treatment and structural Best Management Practices for stormwater. These new and/or expanded facilities may result in adverse physical effect on the environment. Potential environmental impacts must be addressed within the appropriate technical studies and analyzed in the EIR.

- e) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The proposed project site is included in the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) boundary line. The site is within the Rincon del Diablo Municipal Water District (RdDMWD). A water service availability letter was received indicating that facilities to serve the project site are expected to be available within 5 years. It also indicates that pipelines will have to be extended and that the planned facilities will have to be completed. One of the planned facilities, a future potable and/or recycled water reservoir, would require extensive hydraulic analysis to determine the potable facility requirements to serve the project which may have home sites above the elevation of the reservoir site. Potential environmental impacts must be addressed within the appropriate technical studies and analyzed in the EIR.

- f) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project, that it has inadequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: The project proposes to annex to the San Diego County Sanitation District and build a wastewater treatment facility, to provide wastewater treatment and reclamation service. The provision of adequate wastewater treatment facilities should be assured through a Sanitation Agreement entered into between the project applicants and the County of San Diego. However, the details of that agreement regarding adequate wastewater capacity must be identified and disclosed within the EIR and appropriate technical studies.

- g) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Less Than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity. Therefore, there is sufficient existing permitted solid waste capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.

- h) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

<input type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Incorporated

Less than Significant Impact: Implementation of the project will generate solid waste. All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. In San Diego County, the County Department of Environmental Health, Local Enforcement Agency issues solid waste facility permits with concurrence from the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) under the authority of the Public Resources Code (Sections 44001-44018) and California Code of Regulations Title 27, Division 2, Subdivision 1, Chapter 4 (Section 21440et seq.). The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility and will comply with Federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

- a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Incorporated

Potentially Significant Impact: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory were considered in the response to each question in sections IV and V of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this evaluation considered the projects potential for significant cumulative effects. As a result of this evaluation, the project was determined to have potential significant effects related to Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Mineral Resources, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic, Utilities and Service Systems. While mitigation has been proposed in some instances that reduce these effects to a level below significance, the effectiveness of this mitigation to clearly reduce the impact to a level below significance is unclear. Therefore, this project has been determined to potentially meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Incorporated

Potentially Significant Impact: Per the instructions for evaluating environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse cumulative effects were considered in the response to each question in sections I through XVIII of this form. In addition to project specific impacts, this

evaluation considered the projects potential for incremental effects that are cumulatively considerable. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant cumulative effects related to Aesthetics, Agricultural Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Global Greenhouse Gases, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, Hydrology and Water Quality, Land Use and Planning, Noise, Population and Housing, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation/Traffic, and Utilities and Service Systems. While mitigation has been proposed in some instances that reduce these cumulative effects to a level below significance, the effectiveness of this mitigation to clearly reduce the impact to a level below significance is unclear. Therefore, this project has been determined to potentially meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

- c) Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Potentially Significant Impact	<input type="checkbox"/> Less than Significant Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated	<input type="checkbox"/> No Impact

Potentially Significant Impact: In the evaluation of environmental impacts in this Initial Study, the potential for adverse direct or indirect impacts to human beings were considered in the response to certain questions in sections I. Aesthetics, III. Air Quality, VI. Geology and Soils, VIII. Hazards and Hazardous Materials, IX Hydrology and Water Quality XII. Noise, XIII. Population and Housing, and XVI. Transportation and Traffic. As a result of this evaluation, there were determined to be potentially significant effects related to all of these. While mitigation has been proposed in some instances that reduce these significant effects to a level below significance, the effectiveness of this mitigation to clearly reduce the impact to a level below significance is unclear. Therefore, this project has been determined to potentially meet this Mandatory Finding of Significance.

XIX. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

All references to Federal, State and local regulation are available on the Internet. For Federal regulation, refer to <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/>. For State regulation, refer to www.leginfo.ca.gov. For County regulation refer to www.amlegal.com. All other references are available upon request.

AESTHETICS

California Street and Highways Code [California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283.
(<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/>)

California Scenic Highway Program, California Streets and Highways Code, Section 260-283.
(<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LandArch/scenic/scpr.htm>)

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use. The Zoning Ordinance of San Diego County. Sections 5200-5299; 5700-5799; 5900-5910, 6322-6326.
(www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-73: Hillside Development Policy. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-104: Policy and Procedures for Preparation of Community Design Guidelines, Section 396.10 of the County Administrative Code and Section 5750 et seq. of the County Zoning Ordinance. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego Light Pollution Code, Title 5, Division 9 (Sections 59.101-59.115 of the County Code of Regulatory Ordinances) as added by Ordinance No 6900, effective January 18, 1985, and amended July 17, 1986 by Ordinance No. 7155. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Wireless Communications Ordinance [San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances.
(www.amlegal.com)

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County. (Alpine, Bonsall, Fallbrook, Julian, Lakeside, Ramona, Spring Valley, Sweetwater, Valley Center).

Federal Communications Commission, Telecommunications Act of 1996 [Telecommunications Act of 1996, Pub. LA. No. 104-104, 110 Stat. 56 (1996).
(<http://www.fcc.gov/Reports/tcom1996.txt>)

Institution of Lighting Engineers, Guidance Notes for the Reduction of Light Pollution, Warwickshire, UK, 2000
(<http://www.dark-skies.org/ile-gd-e.htm>)

International Light Inc., Light Measurement Handbook, 1997.
(www.intl-light.com)

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Lighting Research Center,
National Lighting Product Information Program (NLPPI),
Lighting Answers, Volume 7, Issue 2, March 2003.
(www.lrc.rpi.edu)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000, Urbanized Area Outline
Map, San Diego, CA.
(<http://www.census.gov/geo/www/maps/ua2kmaps.htm>)

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management
(BLM) modified Visual Management System.
(www.blm.gov)

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway
Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for
Highway Projects.

US Department of Transportation, National Highway System
Act of 1995 [Title III, Section 304. Design Criteria for the
National Highway System.
(<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legregs/nhsdatoc.html>)

AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

California Department of Conservation, Farmland Mapping
and Monitoring Program, "A Guide to the Farmland
Mapping and Monitoring Program," November 1994.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Department of Conservation, Office of Land
Conversion, "California Agricultural Land Evaluation and
Site Assessment Model Instruction Manual," 1997.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Farmland Conservancy Program, 1996.
(www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Land Conservation (Williamson) Act, 1965.
(www.ceres.ca.gov, www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Right to Farm Act, as amended 1996.
(www.qp.gov.bc.ca)

County of San Diego Agricultural Enterprises and Consumer
Information Ordinance, 1994, Title 6, Division 3, Ch. 4.
Sections 63.401-63.408. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Department of Agriculture, Weights
and Measures, "2002 Crop Statistics and Annual Report,"
2002. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource
Conservation Service LESA System.
(www.nrcs.usda.gov, www.swcs.org).

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the
San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

AIR QUALITY

CEQA Air Quality Analysis Guidance Handbook, South
Coast Air Quality Management District, Revised
November 1993. (www.aqmd.gov)

County of San Diego Air Pollution Control District's Rules
and Regulations, updated August 2003. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Clean Air Act US Code; Title 42; Chapter 85
Subchapter 1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

BIOLOGY

California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW).
Southern California Coastal Sage Scrub Natural
Community Conservation Planning Process Guidelines.

CDFW and California Resources Agency, Sacramento,
California. 1993. (www.dfg.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, An Ordinance Amending the San
Diego County Code to Establish a Process for Issuance of
the Coastal Sage Scrub Habitat Loss Permits and
Declaring the Urgency Thereof to Take Effect
Immediately, Ordinance No. 8365. 1994, Title 8, Div 6,
Ch. 1. Sections 86.101-86.105, 87.202.2.
(www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Ord.
Nos. 8845, 9246, 1998 (new series). (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

County of San Diego, Implementing Agreement by and
between United States Fish and Wildlife Service,
California Department of Fish and Wildlife and County of
San Diego. County of San Diego, Multiple Species
Conservation Program, 1998.

County of San Diego, Multiple Species Conservation
Program, County of San Diego Subarea Plan, 1997.

Holland, R.R. Preliminary Descriptions of the Terrestrial
Natural Communities of California. State of California,
Resources Agency, Department of Fish and Wildlife,
Sacramento, California, 1986.

Memorandum of Understanding [Agreement Between United
States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), California
Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), California
Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF), San
Diego County Fire Chief's Association and the Fire
District's Association of San Diego County.

Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v County of Stanislaus (5th
Dist. 1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 155-159 [39 Cal. Rptr.2d
54]. (www.ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Environmental Laboratory.
Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. U.S.
Army Corps of Engineers, Wetlands Research Program
Technical Report Y-87-1. 1987.
(<http://www.wes.army.mil/>)

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. America's wetlands:
our vital link between land and water. Office of Water,
Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds. EPA843-K-
95-001. 1995b. (www.epa.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries
Service. Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook.
Department of Interior, Washington, D.C. 1996.
(endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries
Service. Consultation Handbook: Procedures for
Conducting Consultation and Conference Activities Under
Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act. Department of
Interior, Washington, D.C. 1998. (endangered.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Environmental Assessment
and Land Protection Plan for the Vernal Pools
Stewardship Project. Portland, Oregon. 1997.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Vernal Pools of Southern
California Recovery Plan. U.S. Department of Interior,
Fish and Wildlife Service, Region One, Portland, Oregon,
1998. (ecos.fws.gov)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Birds of conservation concern
2002. Division of Migratory. 2002.
(migratorybirds.fws.gov)

CULTURAL RESOURCES

- California Health & Safety Code. §18950-18961, State Historic Building Code. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Health & Safety Code. §5020-5029, Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Health & Safety Code. §7050.5, Human Remains. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, (AB 978), 2001. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Public Resources Code §5024.1, Register of Historical Resources. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Public Resources Code. §5031-5033, State Landmarks. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Public Resources Code. §5097-5097.6, Archaeological, Paleontological, and Historic Sites. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Public Resources Code. §5097.9-5097.991, Native American Heritage. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- City of San Diego. Paleontological Guidelines. (revised) August 1998.
- County of San Diego, Local Register of Historical Resources (Ordinance 9493), 2002. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)
- Demere, Thomas A., and Stephen L. Walsh. Paleontological Resources San Diego County. Department of Paleontology, San Diego Natural History Museum. 1994.
- Moore, Ellen J. Fossil Mollusks of San Diego County. San Diego Society of Natural history. Occasional; Paper 15. 1968.
- U.S. Code including: American Antiquities Act (16 USC §431-433) 1906. Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act (16 USC §461-467), 1935. Reservoir Salvage Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1960. Department of Transportation Act (49 USC §303) 1966. National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC §470 et seq.) 1966. National Environmental Policy Act (42 USC §4321) 1969. Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC §1451) 1972. National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 USC §1431) 1972. Archaeological and Historical Preservation Act (16 USC §469-469c) 1974. Federal Land Policy and Management Act (43 USC §35) 1976. American Indian Religious Freedom Act (42 USC §1996 and 1996a) 1978. Archaeological Resources Protection Act (16 USC §470aa-mm) 1979. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (25 USC §3001-3013) 1990. Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (23 USC §101, 109) 1991. American Battlefield Protection Act (16 USC 469k) 1996. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

GEOLOGY & SOILS

- California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, California Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Fault-Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Special Publication 42, revised 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)
- California Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, Special Publication 117, Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California, 1997. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances Title 6, Division 8, Chapter 3, Septic Ranks and Seepage Pits. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego Department of Environmental Health, Land and Water Quality Division, February 2002. On-site Wastewater Systems (Septic Systems): Permitting Process and Design Criteria. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Natural Resource Inventory, Section 3, Geology.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973. (soils.usda.gov)

HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- American Planning Association, Zoning News, "Saving Homes from Wildfires: Regulating the Home Ignition Zone," May 2001.
- California Building Code (CBC), Seismic Requirements, Chapter 16 Section 162. (www.buildersbook.com)
- California Education Code, Section 17215 and 81033. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Government Code. § 8585-8589, Emergency Services Act. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Hazardous Waste and Substances Site List. April 1998. (www.dtsc.ca.gov)
- California Health & Safety Code Chapter 6.95 and §25117 and §25316. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Health & Safety Code § 2000-2067. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Health & Safety Code. §17922.2. Hazardous Buildings. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)
- California Resources Agency, "OES Dam Failure Inundation Mapping and Emergency Procedures Program", 1996. (ceres.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. California Accidental Release Prevention Program (CalARP) Guidelines. (<http://www.sdcountry.ca.gov/>, www.oes.ca.gov)
- County of San Diego, Department of Environmental Health, Hazardous Materials Division. Hazardous Materials Business Plan Guidelines. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)
- Uniform Building Code. (www.buildersbook.com)
- Uniform Fire Code 1997 edition published by the Western Fire Chiefs Association and the International Conference of Building Officials, and the National Fire Protection Association Standards 13 & 13-D, 1996 Edition, and 13-R, 1996 Edition. (www.buildersbook.com)
- HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY**
- American Planning Association, Planning Advisory Service Report Number 476 Non-point Source Pollution: A Handbook for Local Government
- California Department of Water Resources, California Water Plan Update. Sacramento: Dept. of Water Resources State of California. 1998. (rubicon.water.ca.gov)
- California Department of Water Resources, California's Groundwater Update 2003 Bulletin 118, April 2003. (www.groundwater.water.ca.gov)

California Department of Water Resources, Water Facts, No. 8, August 2000. (www.dpla2.water.ca.gov)

California Disaster Assistance Act. Government Code, § 8680-8692. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California State Water Resources Control Board, NPDES General Permit Nos. CAS000001 INDUSTRIAL ACTIVITIES (97-03-DWQ) and CAS000002 Construction Activities (No. 99-08-DWQ) (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

California Storm Water Quality Association, California Storm Water Best Management Practice Handbooks, 2003.

California Water Code, Sections 10754, 13282, and 60000 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

Colorado River Basin Regional Water Quality Control Board, Region 7, Water Quality Control Plan. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

County of San Diego Regulatory Ordinance, Title 8, Division 7, Grading Ordinance. Grading, Clearing and Watercourses. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego, Groundwater Ordinance. #7994. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov, <http://www.amlegal.com/>.)

County of San Diego, Project Clean Water Strategic Plan, 2002. (www.projectcleanwater.org)

County of San Diego, Watershed Protection, Storm Water Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance, Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426. Chapter 8, Division 7, Title 6 of the San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances and amendments. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego. Board of Supervisors Policy I-68. Diego Proposed Projects in Flood Plains with Defined Floodways. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act), 1972, Title 33, Ch.26, Sub-Ch.1. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Freeze, Allan and Cherry, John A., Groundwater, Prentice-Hall, Inc. New Jersey, 1979.

Heath, Ralph C., Basic Ground-Water Hydrology, United States Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper; 2220, 1991.

National Flood Insurance Act of 1968. (www.fema.gov)

National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994. (www.fema.gov)

Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, California Water Code Division 7. Water Quality. (ceres.ca.gov)

San Diego Association of Governments, Water Quality Element, Regional Growth Management Strategy, 1997. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, NPDES Permit No. CAS0108758. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board, Water Quality Control Plan for the San Diego Basin. (www.swrcb.ca.gov)

LAND USE & PLANNING

California Department of Conservation Division of Mines and Geology, Open File Report 96-04, Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production Consumption Region, 1996. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code 21000-21178; California Code of Regulations,

Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, Appendix G, Title 14, Chapter 3, §15000-15387. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California State Mining and Geology Board, SP 51, California Surface Mining and Reclamation Policies and Procedures, January 2000. (www.consrv.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-84: Project Facility. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board Policy I-38, as amended 1989. (www.sdcountry.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, General Plan as adopted August 3, 2011. (ceres.ca.gov)

County of San Diego. Resource Protection Ordinance, compilation of Ord.Nos. 7968, 7739, 7685 and 7631. 1991.

Design Review Guidelines for the Communities of San Diego County.

MINERAL RESOURCES

National Environmental Policy Act, Title 42, 36.401 et. seq. 1969. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

Subdivision Map Act, 2011. (ceres.ca.gov)

U.S. Geologic Survey, Causey, J. Douglas, 1998, MAS/MILS Mineral Location Database.

U.S. Geologic Survey, Frank, David G., 1999, (MRDS) Mineral Resource Data System.

NOISE

California State Building Code, Part 2, Title 24, CCR, Appendix Chapter 3, Sound Transmission Control, 1988. . (www.buildersbook.com)

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 3, Div 6, Chapter 4, Noise Abatement and Control, effective February 4, 1982. (www.amlegal.com)

County of San Diego General Plan, Noise Element, effective August 3, 2011. (ceres.ca.gov)

Federal Aviation Administration, Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 150 Airport Noise Compatibility Planning (revised January 18, 1985). (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/>)

Harris Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., *Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment*, April 1995. (<http://ntl.bts.gov/data/rail05/rail05.html>)

International Standard Organization (ISO), ISO 362; ISO 1996 1-3; ISO 3095; and ISO 3740-3747. (www.iso.ch)

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Office of Environment and Planning, Noise and Air Quality Branch. "Highway Traffic Noise Analysis and Abatement Policy and Guidance," Washington, D.C., June 1995. (<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/>)

POPULATION & HOUSING

Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, 42 USC 5309, Title 42--The Public Health And Welfare, Chapter 69--Community Development, United States Congress, August 22, 1974. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

National Housing Act (Cranston-Gonzales), Title 12, Ch. 13. (www4.law.cornell.edu)

San Diego Association of Governments Population and Housing Estimates, November 2000. (www.sandag.org)

US Census Bureau, Census 2000. (<http://www.census.gov/>)

RECREATION

County of San Diego Code of Regulatory Ordinances, Title 8, Division 10, Chapter PLDO, §810.101 et seq. Park Lands Dedication Ordinance. (www.amlegal.com)

TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

California Aeronautics Act, Public Utilities Code, Section 21001 et seq. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, California Airport Land Use Planning Handbook, January 2002.

California Department of Transportation, Environmental Program Environmental Engineering – Noise, Air Quality, and Hazardous Waste Management Office. "Traffic Noise Analysis Protocol for New Highway Construction and Reconstruction Projects," October 1998. (www.dot.ca.gov)

California Public Utilities Code, SDCRAA. Public Utilities Code, Division 17, Sections 170000-170084. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

California Street and Highways Code. California Street and Highways Code, Section 260-283. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Alternative Fee Schedules with Pass-By Trips Addendum to Transportation Impact Fee Reports, March 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/land/pdf/TransImpactFee/attacha.pdf>)

County of San Diego Transportation Impact Fee Report. January 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Fallbrook & Ramona Transportation Impact Fee Report, County of San Diego, January 2005. (<http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/dpw/permits-forms/manuals.html>)

Office of Planning, Federal Transit Administration, Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment, Final Report, April 1995.

San Diego Association of Governments, 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. Prepared by the San Diego Association of Governments. (www.sandag.org)

San Diego County Regional Airport Authority ALUCP'S http://www.san.org/sdcraa/airport_initiatives/land_use/adopted_docs.aspx

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77. (www.gpoaccess.gov)

UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS

California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14. Natural Resources Division, CIWMB Division 7; and Title 27, Environmental Protection Division 2, Solid Waste. (ccr.oal.ca.gov)

California Integrated Waste Management Act. Public Resources Code, Division 30, Waste Management, Sections 40000-41956. (www.leginfo.ca.gov)

County of San Diego, Board of Supervisors Policy I-78: Small Wastewater. (www.sdcounty.ca.gov)

Unified San Diego County Emergency Services Organization Annex T Emergency Water Contingencies, October 1992. (www.co.san-diego.ca.us)

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service LESA System.

United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Survey for the San Diego Area, California. 1973.

US Census Bureau, Census 2000.

US Code of Federal Regulations, Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace, Title 14, Chapter 1, Part 77.

US Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) modified Visual Management System.

US Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Visual Impact Assessment for Highway Projects.